UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/694,797	10/20/2000	E. Castedo Ellerman	TEL-00-003-1P	1588

24488 7590 06/09/2004

BEVER, HOFFMAN & HARMS, LLP
1432 CONCANNON BLVD
BLDG G
LIVERMORE, CA 94550-6006

EXAMINER	
LIEN, TAN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/694,797	ELLERMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tan Lien	~~2141~~ 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 October 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *5,6 and 11* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *20 October 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4,5*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTIONS

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The wording "legal entities can to provide services" is a typo of some sort (Detailed Description, Introduction, page 8 line 2).

Figure 4 is referred in the specification but it is not in the application (Detailed Description, Definition, User Profile, page 9, line 7).

The term "legal" in "legal entity" used in claims 5 and 6 does not served to limit anything in particular; therefore, the examiner will assume "legal entity" as "entity" for the two claims and examine them accordingly.

The sentence in claim 11 seems like an incomplete sentence. The examiner will assume the last two words in claim 11 are in the phrase referring to claim 9 instead of words part of the sentence structure. The examiner put the two words in quotes and read as 'after the phrase "automatically providing" in claim 9'.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim(s) 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear as to which "the using" the applicant is referring to. Is it "the using of the first computer", "the using of the URL" or "the using of telephone identifying information" that the applicant is referring to?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim(s) 1-3, 5-6, 8-9, and 11-14 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laursen et al (US Patent 6,065,120), hereinafter referred to as

Laursen, in view of Kallas et al (US Patent 6,701,366 B1), hereinafter referred to as Kallas.

Claim(s) 1, 14: Laursen discloses a method of linking a web based account to a phone based account over the world wide web, the method comprising:

receiving a connection request from a first computer (col. 1, lines 51-60 and Fig. 5.a; wherein the first computer is the client where the client can be a mobile phone or a personal digital assistant, which also has a micro browser {col. 3, line14-16}) on a second computer (col. 13, lines 44-46 and Fig. 2.a, ref. 128; wherein the second computer is the host server doing the procedure shown in Fig. 5.b), the connection request formatted as a uniform resource locator (URL), the URL (Fig. 1, ref. 112 shows a web server the client is connecting to so it is using a format that is in accordance with that of URL) further specifying a linking code (col. 14, lines 6-15, and Fig. 2.b, ref. 114 shows a link server that has the client's ID or the Device ID and the subscriber's number) and a return location (Fig. 6, ref. 300 in the URL text field; wherein the login page is the return location after activation of the client or "linking" the web based account stored in the host server to the client's phone based account so that the user can log into the web based account to do the things shown in Fig. 7, Fig. 8, Fig. 9, and Fig. 10), the linking code corresponding to an identifier provided by a third computer (Fig. 2.a, ref. 134; wherein the third computer is the server 1 or server 2 providing the identifier, username and password, at login to the host server) to the first

computer and identifying the web based account on the third computer (Fig. 6, ref. 302 and 304; wherein the web based account is the username and password provided by the user);

responsive to one or more messages between the first computer and the second computer, identifying the phone based account (col. 14, lines 21-28; wherein the new user credential information is updated in the host server in response to the request and the new user credential information is linked to the phone based account which is the device ID stored in the host server); and

storing the linking code in the phone based account (col. 3, lines 10-17).

Although Laursen discloses the storing of the linking code in the phone based account, Laursen fails to disclose storing it as a cookie. Kallas, however, discloses the use of a telephony cookie to store account name and password (col. 13, lines 35-46 of Kallas). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to store Laursen's linking code information in the phone based account as Kallas' telephony cookie. The reason why Laursen would want to do so is because it would save time and effort for not having the client user to retype the saved information as a cookie (col. 12, lines 13-15 and col. 13, lines 42-46 of Kallas). The user would use the cookie storing

account information in the client to the host server instead of having to send the retype information to the host server.

Claim(s) 2: Laursen discloses the method of claim 1, wherein

the return location comprises a URL (col. 14, lines 11-12; wherein when the user sends an activation request from the client, the user has to get a URL from the service provider in return in order for the user to go to the login screen {Fig. 6} to personalize one's web settings),

the method further comprising sending a message from the second computer to the first computer (Fig. 4 shows sending of session request messages),

the message instructing the first computer to send a connection request to a computer identified by the URL in the return location (Fig. 6 shows the user requesting to connect to the URL [http://www.mobile.att.net/pocknet/personal.cgi]).

Claim(s) 3: Laursen discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the method occurs entirely in response to a single action (col. 3, lines25-27; wherein the single action is calling the activation number for linking the phone account to web account).

Claim(s) 5: Laursen discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the first computer comprises

a computer operated by an individual (col. 1, lines 54-55; wherein the individual is one of the users) and the second computer operated by a legal entity that supports access to the phone based account (Fig. 2.b, ref. 128; wherein the host server is serving as a legal entity that give access to the web page shown in Fig. 7-10 and the phone based account is the subscription number that associates the web account username and password) for the individual vial a telephone interface (Fig. 2.b, ref. 114; wherein the linking server serves as a telephone interface).

Claim(s) 6: Laursen discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the second computer and the third computer are operated by different legal entities (Fig. 2.b, ref. 128 show one entity, the host server, and ref. 110 shows a different entity).

Claim(s) 8: Laursen discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the return location comprises

a URL (col. 14, lines 11-12; wherein when the user sends an activation request from the client, the user has to get a URL from the service provider in return in order for the user to go to the login screen {Fig. 6} to personalize one's web settings) and the cookie is stored in the phone based account with a predetermined name (col. 2, lines 58-67; wherein the predetermined name is the username. The name has to be in the system or host server before a user can use the mobile device to activate the mobile device or associating the mobile

device to the name used by the web account.), the value of the linking code (col. 14, lines 29-40 and Fig. 6, ref. 302 showing the value of the linking code as "marylee") and the domain of the return location (Fig. 6, ref. 300 shows in the URL text field the domain being [www.mobile.att.net]).

Claim(s) 9: Laursen discloses a method of accessing a web based account over a telephone interface using the telephone identifying information and a first computer, the method comprising:

identifying a phone account using the first computer and the telephone identifying information (Fig. 2.b, ref. 140, 106 and 114; wherein the first computer is the mobile device capable of web browsing via a micro browser {col. 3, line14-16});

selecting a state associated with the phone account using the first computer (col. 8, lines 35-65; wherein when the user is supplying a username and password on one's mobile device one is supplying a state information associated to the phone account with a device ID);

the providing responsive to receiving a request over the telephone interface to initiate an application on a second computer (col. 14, lines 21-28; wherein the application is updating new user credential information in the host server in response to the request and the new user credential information is linked to the phone based account which is the device ID stored in the host server); and

the linking code identifying a web account to the second computer (col. 14, lines 6-15; wherein the second is the host server and Fig. 2.b, ref. 114 shows a link server that has the client's ID or the Device ID and the subscriber's number).

Although Laursen discloses selecting a state associated with the phone account using the first computer, Laursen fails to disclose the state comprising a plurality of cookies. Kallas, however, discloses a state comprising a plurality of cookies (col. 2, lines 54-56, Fig. 12 and Fig. 14 of Kallas) and storing cookies on the client (col. 13, lines 35-46 of Kallas). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a plurality of cookies to store the state information. The reason why Laursen would want to do so is because it would save time and effort for not having the client user to retype the saved information as a cookie (col. 12, lines 13-15 and col. 13, lines 42-46 of Kallas). The user would use the cookie storing account information in the client to the host server instead of having to send the retype information to the host server.

Laursen also fails to disclose automatically providing a subset of the plurality of cookies to the application using the first computer, wherein the subset of the plurality of cookies includes at least one cookie including a linking code. Kallas, however, discloses automatically providing a subset of the cookies to the

application, wherein the subset of the cookies include a linking code (col. 13, lines 33-46; wherein the linking code is the username and password stored as a telephony cookie on the client). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide automatically Kallas' state method of plurality of telephony cookies to store Laursen's linking code. The reason why Laursen would want to provide the linking code automatically is because it would save time and effort for not having the client user to retype the saved information as a cookie (col. 13, lines 13-15 and col. 13, lines 42-46 of Kallas). The user would use the cookie storing account information in the client to the host server instead of having to send the retype information to the host server

Claim(s) 11: Laursen discloses a method of claim 9, but fails to disclose automatically removing at least one cookie including from the plurality of cookies after the "automatically providing". Kallas, however, discloses the expiration of the cookie and removing the cookie after the expiration date (col. 12, lines 25-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have Laursen's method remove Kallas' telephony cookie after an expiration date. The reason why Laursen would want to remove it is because Laursen no longer needs to use the cookie after the expiration date (col.12, lines 24-58). That's why the expiration date was set in the first place.

Claim(s) 12: Laursen discloses a method of claim 9, wherein responsive to receiving the at least one cookie including the linking code,

the application is capable of accessing information associated with the related web account (Fig. 2.b, ref. 152 shows a phone account and a web account in the account entry and the application has to authenticate the user before access, so it has to be able to access the web account information).

Claim(s) 13: Laursen discloses a method of claim 9, wherein subsequent to receiving the at least one cookie including the linking code,

the application receives a string, the string corresponding to single key DTMF sequence of a password for the related web account (col. 8, lines 38-60; wherein the string is the username followed by password and the single key DTMF sequence is pressing the phone key), and wherein the application is capable of accessing information associated with the related web account using the string (col. 8, lines 38-60; wherein the user is using a phone to set one's username and password string, and after that is done, the user goes to a PC and use the set string to access the web site. Fig. 8-10 shows the application is accessing information associated with the related web account using the using the username and password string).

Claim(s) 4 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laursen in view of Kallas and further in view of Safari Tech Books Online Java 2 in 21 days by Laura Lemay and Rogers Cadenhead, hereinafter referred to as Java2.

Claim(s) 4: Laursen discloses the method in claim 3, but fails to disclose the single action comprises

a mouse click. Java2, however, discloses the use of a single mouse click to trigger a mouse click event. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a mouse click to trigger the procedure in Laursen's method. The reason why Laursen would want to use it is because it would be easier for Laursen to use a mouse click to trigger an event then to press multiple keys (Chapter 13. Responding to User Input in an Applet, Handling Mouse Clicks).

Claim(s) 7 and 15 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laursen in view of Kallas and further in view of Google's "A generalized wallet architure" by N. Daswani and others, hereinafter referred to as Google.

Claim(s) 7: Laursen discloses the method in claim 1, wherein the

URL formatted in the connection request, but fails to disclose a wallet indicator, the wallet indicator provided by the third computer and indicating that the third computer will share commerce related information relating to the web account

with the second computer. Google, however, discloses a digital wallet that can be used for proprietary financial instruments and protocols for electronic commerce transactions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Google's digital wallet in Laursen's method. The reason why Laursen would want to use the digital wallet is because it provides secure financial transactions over the Internet and that this new digital wallet can support multiple existing and newly developed instruments and protocols across end-user, vendor, and bank applications (Abstract of the article "A generalized wallet architecture").

Claim(s) 15: Laursen discloses a method of obtaining a customer information over a telephone interface using telephone identifying information and a first computer, the method comprising:

identifying a phone account using the first computer and the telephone identifying information (Fig. 2.b, ref. 140, 106 and 114; wherein the first computer is the mobile device capable of web browsing via a micro browser {col. 3, line14-16});

selecting a state associated with the phone account using the first computer (col. 8, lines 35-65; wherein when the user is supplying a username and password on one's mobile device one is supplying a state information associated to the phone account with a device ID); and

using the URL to obtain the customer information from the second computer (Fig. 8 shows user's or customer's personal information after the customer logs into the system using the URL, so it must be obtain and stored in the system).

Although Laursen discloses selecting a state associated with the phone account using the first computer, Laursen fails to disclose the state comprising a plurality of cookies. Kallas, however, discloses a state comprising a plurality of cookies (col. 2, lines 54-56, Fig. 12 and Fig. 14 of Kallas) and storing cookies on the client (col. 13, lines 35-46 of Kallas). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a plurality of cookies to store the state information. The reason why Laursen would want to do so is because it would save time and effort for not having the client user to retype the saved information as a cookie (col. 12, lines 13-15 and col. 13, lines 42-46 of Kallas). The user would use the cookie storing account information in the client to send to the host server instead of having to send the retype information to the host server.

Laursen and Kallas discloses a method of selecting at least one of the plurality of cookies, but fail to disclose the cookies comprising a wallet indicator, the wallet indicator comprising an URL for obtaining customer information from a second computer. Google, on the other hand, discloses a digital wallet that can be used for proprietary financial instruments and protocols for electronic commerce

transactions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Google's digital wallet in Laursen's and Kallas' method. The reason why Laursen and Kallas would want to use the digital wallet is because it provides secure financial transactions over the Internet and that this new digital wallet can support multiple existing and newly developed instruments and protocols across end-user, vendor, and bank applications (Abstract of the article "A generalized wallet architecture").

Claim(s) 10 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laursen in view of Kallas and further in view of Safari Tech Books Online, "Using HTML 4, XML, and Java 1.2" by Eric Ladd and Jim O'Dannell et al, hereinafter referred to as Safari Online.

Claim(s) 10: Laursen discloses a method in claim 9 above.

Laursen fails to disclose a method, wherein the automatically providing occurs over a communication channel encrypted according to one or more of a secure sockets layer (SSL) protocol and a transport layer security (TLS) protocol. Safari Online, however, discloses the use of SSL protocol to provide data encryption and ensure security (Chapter 40: Network Programming under Customized Network Solutions, 3rd paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teachings of SSL of Safari Online and combine it with Laursen's communication channel. The reason why

Laursen would want to use SSL as a way of communications is because Laursen wants to take advantage of it's security features such as checking to see if the client and server networks are valid, providing data encryption, and ensuring secure data transmission (Chapter 40: Network Programming under Customized Network Solutions, 3rd paragraph).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Tan Lien whose telephone number is (703) 305-6018. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30am to 6pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3718.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [tan.lien@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a

possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER